



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

diminished by reducing a debt." We call this proposition most important, because it is the only one which corrects a great and widespread popular misapprehension. The general public idea seems to be that if a nation incurs a thousand millions of debt to carry on a war, raising no taxes, she is as rich as when she commenced, and that the impoverishment only commences when she undertakes to pay the debt. As a logical consequence, if she leaves this task to posterity, she throws on them all the burden of the war. We conceive this view to be entirely fallacious. The mischief is all done when the war is closed, and the operation of paying off the debt incurred is rather a process of repairing this mischief than one of further exhaustion. We wonder that any clear-headed student of this subject should fail to see the fallacy of the popular notion that, by incurring a debt, the burden of a war is thrown upon posterity, even when the nation borrows the money from its own citizens. We may, indeed, leave a debt to be paid by posterity, but it must be paid to posterity as well as by it, so that the account is balanced. War destroys wealth posterity would otherwise have inherited, so that the latter suffers by it, but this destruction and consequent suffering are quite independent of the financial policy of the combatants.

3. — *Historical Essays.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M. A., Hon. D. C. L., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1871. pp. 406.

MR. FREEMAN stands in the very front rank of living English historians. He is a legitimate successor of Hallam, Palgrave, and Grote. Any book coming from him is therefore sure to attract attention and to receive its full share of approval. Every library which has any pretensions to merit must possess it, and the literary man who neglects to examine it does so at his imminent peril.

Having said so much, we have said all that is required in recommendation of this book, the contents of which are rather necessary to an elementary education than to the attainment of any very advanced knowledge. There is little or no original investigation in these essays, and as for speculation or novel theory, Mr. Freeman cannot be charged with rashness of experiment in this direction. More than half the volume concerns points of continental history, and Mr. Freeman's special grievance, as appears here, is that French ideas of continental history are utterly distorted, and that Englishmen, and we may add Americans, are profoundly ignorant of anything except French ideas.

This is not a very lofty aim for an historian of Mr. Freeman's rank ; if he stops to fight with elementary ignorance and to teach his readers their alphabet, he is not likely ever to do much more. The audience which requires to be taught that Burgundy and Guienne were once independent of Normandy and Paris, is not likely to grasp more than a very few such facts, and will not advance far into the study of real difficulties. As the best example of more serious work of the same kind, the essay on Kirk's Charles the Bold will probably most interest American readers. In three other essays, *passim*, Mr. Freeman assaults the French "Empire" with much success, but with a very vicious temper. As usual with his controversial work, he ends in producing a feeling of reaction against himself and his very just though rather commonplace ideas. That France has grown wholly at the expense of her old neighbors is naturally true ; she must have done so or not have grown at all. That she has covered many very infamous violations of international comity with a special excuse of a quite imaginary national unity, is as true as it is that the German "Reich" (since Mr. Freeman objects to the word "Empire" in a narrow sense) habitually covered very ugly transactions with its Eastern neighbors under the veil of religion, and exacted tributes or annexed territory solely in the interests of Christ and the Church. But a passage like the following is altogether bungling and inartistic in effect ; it would drive even a German into remonstrance, and fail to rouse anything but a laugh in the most sensitive of Frenchmen : —

"When Louis Napoleon Buonaparte first expressed his wish to become master of Savoy, the word selected for the occasion was the verb 'révendiquer,' and the actual process of annexation is expressed by the noun 'réunion' and the verb 'réunir.' At first sight this seems very much as if a burglar who asked for your money or your life should be said to 'révendiquer' the contents of your purse, and afterwards to effect a 'réunion' between them and the contents of his own. According to all etymology 'révendiquer' must mean to claim back again something which you have lost, and 'réunion' must mean the joining together of things which have been separated after being originally one. Now undoubtedly in modern French usage the particle 're' has lost its natural force, and 'réunion' has come simply to mean 'union.' . . . It is a most speaking fact that in any language 'réunion' should have come to mean the same as 'union.' It could only have come to do so in the language of a country where a long series of fraudulent or violent 'unions' had been ingeniously passed off as lawful 'réunions.'"

Here is an ingenious etymological theory, much livelier at any rate,

if not better founded, than many of its author's favorite historical notions. But in the first place, even if it is assumed that Mr. Freeman's philology is equal to the very best German standard, one must still remonstrate against one wilful, malicious, and unjustifiable calumny of "Louis Napoleon Buonaparte," a calumny which must add a considerable sting to the sufferings of that unfortunate man. The literary style of the ex-Emperor has often been sharply criticised, as it possibly deserved, but it certainly passes the limits of fair play when Mr. Freeman actually ventures to make the Emperor responsible for Mr. Freeman's own French. We will risk a heavy stake on the assertion that the Emperor never used the word "*révendiquer*," and that no one but an Englishman not very much at home in French, nor very well fitted for philological theorizing, would ever have put the word in a Frenchman's mouth.

But setting aside such trifles as accents, which Englishmen have for many centuries agreed to despise, it still seems a little surprising that Mr. Freeman should ever have committed himself to such a statement as the one quoted above. It is surprising because there is in English history a curious anecdote with which Mr. Freeman must be perfectly well acquainted, which bears on this very point. The story is told of Harry Marten the regicide, who in the fervor of republicanism spoke of England, in full Parliament, as "*restored* to its ancient government of Commonwealth." Marten was at once attacked for ignorance of the English language and of history, with as much temper as if he had been a French Emperor and Mr. Freeman his critic, and as he was neither Emperor nor historian nor philologist, but only a wit, he fell back on an authority which Mr. Freeman might also consult to advantage. "There was," said he, "a text which had often troubled his spirit concerning the man who was blind from his mother's womb, but at length whose sight was *restored* to the sight *which he should have had*."

Barring Mr. Freeman's most inveterate prejudices, he is, when there is neither a French Emperor to abuse nor an Anglo-Saxon king or earl to worship, a hard student and an honest workman. That he is or ever can be a great historian, in any high sense of the word, is difficult to believe. He has read the great German historians, and he probably admires them, but he has certainly failed to understand either their method or their aims. He shows only a limited capacity for critical combinations, and he has a true English contempt for novel theories. In spite of his labors, the history of the Norman Conquest and an accurate statement of Anglo-Saxon institutions still remain as far from realization as ever. Yet Americans owe him some love, if

only because he was not one of their English enemies in days when they had few English friends.

A few slight errors in this volume require correction. Page 190: "King Charles was succeeded by his son Lothair," should read, "King Louis";—Louis d'Outremer. Mr. Freeman comes near treating Mr. Kington as unfairly as he does the Emperor Napoleon. Page 297: "In 1210 Frederick was elected king; two years later, Otto, in Mr. [Kington] Oliphant's words, 'rushed on his doom.'" The words are indeed Mr. Kington's, but the date belongs to Mr. Freeman. Frederick II. had the ill fortune to be three times elected king, but never in the year 1210. The election here meant is that of 1212, from which Frederick dated the years of his reign. Again, p. 186: "In 888 Charles the Fat was deposed," and "in 963 Otto the Great finally annexed the Roman Empire and the Italian Kingdom to his own Teutonic crown." Charles the Fat was deposed in 887, and setting aside the fact that Otto did not "finally" annex the Italian Kingdom to his Teutonic crown, but that the Italians continued after him to dispose of their own crown as in the case of Ardoïn of Ivrea in 1002, the date itself is incorrect. Otto the Great was crowned Emperor on the 2d of February, 962.

-
4. —1. *Village Communities in the East and West*. Six Lectures delivered at Oxford by HENRY SUMNER MAINE, Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence in the University. London: John Murray. 1871. pp. 226.
 2. *Agricultural Communities of the Middle Ages*. From the German of E. NASSE. Translated by H. A. OUVRY. Published by the Cobden Club. London: Macmillan & Co. 1871. pp. 100.
 3. *Die Altddeutsche Reichs-und Gerichtsverfassung*. Von DR. RUDOLPH SOHM, ord. Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. Br. Erster Band. Die Fränkische Reichs-und Gerichtsverfassung. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau. 1871. pp. 588.

THERE are many indications that a new historical school must soon develop itself in England, with new methods and with a deeper basis than has yet been required of English historical students. It is clear that the old school is practically worn out, and in spite of various false starts and much premature theorizing, that the new one sooner or later will run its course and triumph. It is now some years since Sir Henry Maine in his "Ancient Law" sketched out with great breadth and boldness one principal path which the new student would